1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN JOSE DIVISION 11 12 IN RE JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC. Case No.: C 06-4327 JW (PVT) SECURITIES LITIGATION 13 ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT ERNST & Young's Motion for Protective ORDER RE RULE 30(B)(6) DEPOSITION; 14 AND DENYING AS MOOT THE MOTION TO **SHORTEN TIME** 15 16 On September 29, 2009, Defendant Ernst & Young filed a motion for protective order 17 regarding a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition, along with a motion to shorten time. Plaintiffs opposed the 18 motion for protection. Having reviewed the papers submitted by the parties, the court finds it 19 appropriate to issue this order without oral argument. Based on the moving papers and the file 20 herein, 21 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Ernst & Young's motion for protection is 22 DENIED. Defendant Ernst & Young has known of the categories for the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition 23 since August 28, 2009, when Plaintiffs notified them of the categories during their meet and confer 24 efforts to schedule the deposition. Defendant Ernst & Young has made no showing that it's current 25 designee is unavailable for deposition on the scheduled date. The fact that the same individual is 26 27 Counsel's unsupported statements do not constitute a factual showing. Moreover, during a telephone hearing regarding other depositions, counsel for Ernst & Young indicated that the designee 28 needed a ruling in time to catch a 4:00 p.m. flight if his appearance is required. Thus it appears the designee is available for his deposition. Order, page 1

Case5:06-cv-04327-JW Document367 Filed10/05/09 Page1 of 2

scheduled for a deposition in his individual capacity three weeks later is not grounds for delaying this Rule 30(b)(6) deposition. Thus, protection under Rule 26(c) is unwarranted. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to shorten time is DENIED as moot. Dated: 10/5/09 United States Magistrate Judge

Case5:06-cv-04327-JW Document367 Filed10/05/09 Page2 of 2